DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 308 592 EA 021 085

AUTHOR Achilles, C. M.
TITLE Building Principal Preparation Programs on Theory, Practice and Research.
PUB DATE 11 Aug 85
NOTE 28p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration (Starkville, MS, August 1985).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Education; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; *Management Development; *Principals; *Supervisor Qualifications

ABSTRACT

This paper advocates that principal preparation programs should be designed on traditional bases. By reviewing existing literature, this article suggests that exemplary principal preparation programs should be founded on a combination of research data, theory, and practice or craft knowledge, and that the contributions of each should be made explicit. In this way the exact blend of each of these three components will be known and can be manipulated as a means of program development and change. (JAM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED308592

BUILDING PRINCIPAL PREPARATION PROGRAMS ON THEORY, PRACTICE AND RESEARCH

By: C.M. Achilles, Professor, Educational Leadership, College of Education, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, 37996-3400

Paper Presented At: National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration;
Mississippi State University
Starkville, Mississippi
August 11, 1985

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

C.M. Achilles

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EA 021 055

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Building Principal Preparation Programs

On Theory, Practice and Research*

Introducing a Lingering Issue

Principal preparation programs probably get produced (built, constructed, developed, devised?) in many ways. Certainly one prevalent way is in response to state, regional or national accreditation requirements. Other ways may be based upon tradition (ala "Fiddler on the Roof") or on the best guesses of those teaching in Institutions of Higher Education (IHE) that prepare principals. These previously mentioned processes often were based on experience (craft knowledge) and may even have been based on implicit or tacit knowledge of research and theory. Miklos (1983) recently discussed some key issues surrounding administrator preparation. So did Hoyle (1985) and several others (e.g., NASSP). This paper suggests that exemplary principal preparation programs should be based on a combination of research data, theory, and practice or craft knowledge, and that the contributions of each should be made explicit. In this way the exact blend of each of the three components will be known and can be manipulated as a means of program development and change.

At NCPEA, August, 1984 in Orono, Maine, there was a discussion about improving preparation programs for school administrators (Achilles, 1984a). That discussion was continued in an article entitled, "Forecast: Stormy Weather Ahead in Educational Administration" (1984b). Both papers expressed the need to improve principal preparation in general and some rationale for moving expeditiously to seek excellence. The NCPEA paper (1984a) suggested some directions for improving the principalship that included careful recruitment

*C.M. Achilles, Professor, Educational Leadership, College of Education, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, 37996-3400; Paper at NCPEA, August 11, 1985, Starkville, MS

based on stated criteria, selection based on rational processes, development of a carefully structured preparation program, and new process for retention of outstanding principals. The paper expands on earlier comments, especially those related to development of the preparation program. Although some very adequate preparation programs may have been developed based upon tradition, certification requirements, or even logic (and these three bases may have emanated from some implicit research, theory, philosophy or practice), this paper describes explicit contributions for the components of theory, research and practice. (A separate paper could be done on each. Undoubtedly there is also need to explore the philosophical bases for our preparation programs).

Theory as a Base for Preparation Programs

Program developers have ample theory upon which to base development of principal preparation programs. Some of the theories, so well known as to not require detailed citation, that the program developers may draw upon include: Idiographic/Nomothetic/Transactional; Other Social Systems Approaches; Initiation of Structure/Consideration; Situational Leadership; Loosely Coupled vs. Bureaucracy; Concern for the Individual vs. Concern for the Organization; Task Orientation vs. Relationship Orientation; Contingency Theory; Organizational Climate, etc. Programs can include concepts from the behavioral sciences, communication theory, organizational development, human relations, the medical model, the business model and even deus ex machina.

Figure 1 depicts an hypothetical model for developing a principal preparation program. The model is based on Katz' theory of the blend of skills needed by an administrator (Katz, 1974). Elements of the Katz theory are combined with communication and change theory in this model (Adapted from Achilles and Norman, 1974; Achilles, 1984a:8).

Training Focus	Skill (Katz)			Delivery Mode	Site/Mode
	Conceptual	Technical	Human		
I. Familiarity and Conceptual Control.	I	I	I	I. Classes, Seminars, Reading. Problem-Definition.	Campus. Group work.
II. Understanding, Skill Building. Implementation.		II	II	II. Visits, Observation, Demonstrations. Action Research. Seek Alternatives	Campus and Field. Small group and individual work.
III. Incorporation. Transfer of Skill.	II	III	III	III. Internship, Practicum. Problem-Solving, Change. Implement new programs.	Field. Individual work.
	III				

Figure 1. Diagram of Training Framework showing emphasis on skills (Katz, 1974) at each level (I, II, III) of training focus or purpose (Change Theory). The Katz elements are combined with change process steps (Purpose/ Training Focus) to guide the training. Size relationships in "skill" columns show the approximate emphasis of each purpose for each skill.

The model (Figure 1) suggests that the primary purpose under conceptual skill is conceptual control (Level I, understanding, familiarity or cognitive knowledge) and that this is appropriately delivered by such processes as classes, lectures, seminars, conferences, readings, problem definition activities, etc. Under technical skill the primary purpose is incorporation (III) of a skill into one's own armamentarium, and this is appropriately delivered through hands-on, one-to-one experiences such as internship, practicum, field experiences, problem-solving, etc. With a technical skill, the person needs only a general knowledge of how and why to do this skill, but the person must be able to perform the skill. Human relations skills are distributed more or less equally across the three purposes, but primarily are developed under Level II (understanding, skill building). These skills are built through guided practice offered by laboratories, simulations, etc. The

location of training effort and preferred audience or group size appear in the last column. This represents one example of the possibilities available under the Theory Base category.

Practice or Craft Knowledge as a Base for Preparation Programs

The experiences of successful school administrators certainly deserve attention as content for preparation programs. Blumberg (1985) speaks of the need to understand adminstration not so much either as an art or as a science, but as a craft. Certainly if we accept this metaphor (I find portions of it appealing), the concept of incorporating considerable craft knowledge into our preparation programs is extremely sound. (I personally feel more comfortable with a metaphor of administration that includes art, science and craft -- some might call it craftiness -- as shown by the structure of this paper. The incipient elements of that metaphor appear in Figure A of Appendix A. This idea, admittedly, is not yet well developed).

Another clear use of practice or craft knowledge is in socialization to the role of administration (e.g. the vice-principalship and/or principalship). Socialization is an integral part of the induction process and deserves considerably more attention than it currently gets. Socialization takes many forms, but in preparation programs it is usually done through field work, practice, mentoring or internships. (An aside: most administrators begin as assistant or vice principals, yet most entry-level courses deal with the principalship. Does this anomaly need attention?)

It seems, however, that if we find the same elements occuring repeatedly in practice in the same general situations, and if certain craft-knowledge approaches seem to work repeatedly, then we are remiss if we don't move toward developing a theory to encompass our data sets. The theory, we hope, will be heuristic and give rise to testable hypotheses (or at least questions that can

be explored). In doing this, we will move from craft to the last of the three bases upon which to build principal preparation programs: research.

Research as a Base for Preparation Programs

As sound as the theory and the practice (craft knowledge) approaches are for developing principal preparation programs, I believe that they are secondary to using research and research results as our base. (Note that I would not exclude any of the three bases; a sound preparation program builds upon all three). There currently has been considerable interest in conducting research on just what it is that effective principals seem to do. Erickson (1979:11) discussed the need for attention to research and also connected effective principal leadership to student outcomes. Erickson said, "...knowledge of the educational enterprise will remain deficient until administrative behavior and student learning are empirically linked." There is a challenge here for us to pay attention to research results in developing our principal preparation programs (and then to research the results of our programs).

Articles on school effectiveness continuously point out the necessity of strong building-level leadership. The articles tell us that principals should be instructional leaders; they repeatedly tell us what principals should be or should do. Until recently, few studies have described much about how effective principals go about being effective. Note Donmoyer (1985:31).

> Recent studies of schools almost invariably identify the principal's leadership as a significant factor in a school's success. Unfortunately, these studies provide only limited insight into how principals contribute to their schools' achievements. (Emphasis in original).

There has been considerable interest in discovering just how effective principals behave; what is it they do that seems to lead to effective school outcomes? Donmoyer (1985:40) developed a taxonomy to describe "ways a principal

can get people to do what the principal wants" and described behaviors and strategies that principals use to achieve the conditions of the taxonomy. A study by High (1984) sought to determine how principals could influence teachers.

Firestone and Wilson (1985) defined two types of linkages in schools, the bureaucratic and the cultural, and then described how principals could work within these linkages to improve instruction. Principals control elements of bureaucratic linkages through such things as schedules (control of time); allocation of pupils to classrooms (number of pupils, pupil abilities, specific teacher); distribution of funds/budget (control of resources); curriculum decisions. (Firestone and Wilson, 1985:12).

In their discussion of cultural linkages, Firestone and Wilson (1985:14) relate school cultures fostering excellence to business cultures of excellence as described by Peters and Waterman (1982). Firestone and Wilson describe ways that the principal can manipulate cultural linkages to improve school outcomes. (pp.16-18).

- Principals can manage the flow of information and stories about their schools. E.g. Encourage some stories; limit discussion at faculty meetings, adjust schedules and work space to control communication.

- Principals can create and manipulate symbols and rituals. E.g., academic pep rallies, logos, symbolic rewards for key staff.

- Principals can be communicators of the school culture through the sheer amounts of communications they have; through frequency of interactions.

Elements described in the prior studies are not unlike findings of two recent studies conducted at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville to try to sort out just what it is that effective principals do. The studies were conducted by Keedy (1983) and High (1984).

Keedy (1983) used the "outlier" or discrepency model (regression) to identify instructionally effective rural elementary schools in Tennessee based upon reading achievement. Keedy observed principals in six such schools and later obtained data from principals and teachers via questionnaire. After grouping over 400 samples of observed behaviorand analyzing these within and between schools, he found that principals in these effective schools engaged in continuous "norm setting" behaviors. The 13 prevalent norm setting behaviors could be grouped into primary (n=4) and secondary (n=9) techniques.

The four primary techniques were labeled resource provider, human relations, authority of position and modeling. All principals displayed numerous examples of these behaviors. Norm setting behavior seemed to be initiated through an exchange system, or the norm of reciprocity. Most, but not all, of the principals used most, but not all, of the secondary norm setting techniques: appeal/persuasion, mediator/manipulator, peer pressure, recruitment/selection of teachers, replacement/transfer, decision-making and input (involvement), teacher as go-between, normative distribution of resources, and use of workbooks (to monitor progress). Figure 2 shows the norm setting techniques.

Throughout the study Keedy describes behaviors characteristic of the norm-setting techniques. The fact that teachers confirmed the norm-setting behaviors and could describe their impact suggests that a portion of a training program could be built around norm-setting. (Information about a similar study involving secondary schools was reported at the 1985 AERA Convention. Russell, White and Maurer, 1985).

High (1984) used the concept of influence or bases of social power to study the influence-gaining behaviors of principals in effective and in other elementary and middle schools. All nine schools were involved in a school

improvement effort; none was "ineffective". Data were collected by observation, interview and questionnaires, (principal and teacher). All principals used the seven influence-gaining techniques, or bases of social power, but principals in effective schools used the techniques more. When the influence-gaining techniques were ranked, principals in effective schools used expert, norm setting and legitimate authority most; principals in other schools used involvement, coercion and legitimate authority most. Teachers in effective schools believed that their principals used expertness and the "power of personality" (referent behavior) considerably more than the principals themselves thought that they used these techniques. High studied the actual use of influence-gaining behaviors and the potential of the seven behaviors for influencing teachers. Considerable differences were found in the amount of use (i.e., the sheer energy) of influence-gaining behavior by principals in instructionally effective and in other schools. (Most differences were significant at $p \leq .05$). Table 1 shows the seven bases of social power used by principals in high-achieving and in other schools and the ranking of principals' use of those bases from four data sources. Tables 2 and 3 show differences in the ratings of principal use of the bases of power in high-achieving and in other schools. Note that all statistically significant ($p \leq .05$) differences except one (Table 2, Implementation Survey, Referent) favor principals in high-achieving schools. High found that principal-as-expert had great potential for influencing teachers toward school improvement. These skills can be taught.

Although some have criticized the research design and narrow focus of effective schools research, some effective schools results have been found consistently enough in repeated studies that the results are appropriate for helping to design preparation programs. If student outcomes seem to be related to "strong building leadership", then program designers should be able to

PRINCIPAL NORM SETTING

HUMAN RELATIONS

RESOURCE PROVIDER

AUTHORITY OF POSITION

MODELING

TEACHER DECISION-MAKING/INPUT

TEACHER PEER PRESSURE

MEDIATOR/MANIPULATOR

APPEAL/PERSUASION

RECRUITMENT/SELECTION OF TEACHERS

REPLACEMENT/TRANSFER OF TEACHERS

TEACHER AS GO-BETWEEN

NORMATIVE DISTRIBUTION OF RESOURCES

USE OF WORKBOOK SERIES

FIGURE 2. CATEGORIES OF PRINCIPAL NORM-SETTING TECHNIQUES

FROM ACHILLES AND KEEDY, "PRINCIPAL NORM SETTING AS A COMPONENT OF EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS," NATIONAL FORUM OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION AND SUPERVISION, VOL. 1, NO. 1, PP. 58-68, 1983/84.

TABLE 1

RANKS OF SEVEN PRINCIPAL INFLUENCE-GAINING BEHAVIORS FROM FOUR DATA SOURCES

Behaviors	Teachers		Observers		Implementation Survey		Principals	
	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low
Referent	4	5	4	6	2	1	1.5	6
Expert	1	3	2.5	4	1	3	5	3
Enabler	6	6	5.5	5	3	4	4	5
Coercer	7	7	7	2	5.5	5	6.5	7
Leg. Authority	3	2	2.5	1	4.0	2	1.5	2
Norm Setter	2	1	1	7	5.5	6	3	1
Involver	5	4	5.5	3	7	7	6.5	4
	$r_s = .86$ (.05)		$r_s = -.36$ (NS)		$r_s = .81$ (.05)		$r_s = .43$ (NS)	

High = High-achieving Schools (N=3)

Low = Lower-achieving, or "other" Schools (N=6)

identify just what strong building leadership looks like and, once done, develop training activities to help prepare people for this role.

Research with Project SHAL, St. Louis (Achilles, et al., 1983; Achilles and Young, 1985), identified characteristics of building-level leadership evident in schools implementing an effective schools project. The general descriptors of behavior were not evident equally in all schools, and they seemed to appear in each school at different times in project implementation.

Figure 3 shows three "levels" of observed principal behavior in the effective schools. These behaviors, derived from interview and observation, could provide some direction for preparation programs. In the SHAL project, those schools that had the better student achievement and that also were generally rated above the other schools on the rest of Edmonds' (1979) effective schools correlates (basic skill emphasis, climate, positive expectations and continuous assessment of progress) also had principals who were rated/ranked higher than the other principals on many criteria. The high-performing principals tended to display the behaviors in Figure 3 as the SHAL implementation progressed. In effect, the principal behaviors shown in the levels of Figure 3 fairly represent the growth in principal effectiveness during the three years of SHAL implementation; and principals entering the project in the second and third years began to follow the same general path.

Table 4 shows the results of correlating a total SHAL implementation score (from observation and interview data) with the scores for individual correlates obtained by each of the implementation groups (i.e., number of years in SHAL). Note that positive administrative leadership is the second highest correlation (of five) with the total measure of school effectiveness as shown by implementation of the effective schools model in Project SHALL.

The behaviors identified in the effective schools research can be

TABLE 2

Degree to Which Principals Exhibit Influence-Gaining Behaviors

Behavior	Differences in Teacher Perceptions: High-Achieving vs. Other Schools — U Values: High Ach. Schools * (N=3)	U Values: Other Schools[a] (N=6)	Sig. Levels	Differences in Teacher and Principal Perceptions: High-Achieving Schools — U Values: Prin. (N=3)	U Values: Teacher* (N=3)	Sig. Levels	Differences in Principal Perceptions: High-Achieving vs. Other Schools — U Values: High Ach. Schools (N=3)	U Values: Other Schools (N=6)	Sig. Levels
Referent	18	0	$p \leq .001$	9	0	$p \leq .05$	17.5	.5	$p \leq .002$
Expert	18	0	$p \leq .001$	4	6	$p \leq .50$ ns	7.5	10.5	$p \leq .066$ ns
Enabler	16	2	$p \leq .004$	9	0	$p \leq .05$	13.5	4.5	$p \leq .02$
Coercer	17	1	$p \leq .002$	3	6	$p \leq .35$ ns	11	7	$p \leq .04$
Leg. Auth.	18	0	$p \leq .001$	8	1	$p \leq .10$ ns	13.5	4.5	$p \leq .02$
Norm Setter	14.5	3.5	$p \leq .013$	7	2	$p \leq .20$ ns	13.5	4.5	$p \leq .02$
Involver	10	8	$p \leq .066$ ns	7.5	1.5	$p \leq .15$ ns	9	29	$p \leq .09$ ns

*Teacher n=39; [a]teacher n = 58.

*Teacher n = 39.

TABLE 3

Degree to Which Principals Exhibit Influence-Gaining Behaviors:
High-Achieving Schools vs. Other Schools

	Observation/Interview Ratings			Implementation Survey Results[b]		
	U Values			U Values		
Behavior	High Ach. (N=3)	Other Schools (N=6)	Sig. Levels	High Ach. (N=3)	Other Schools (N=6)	Sig. Levels
Referent	15	3	$p \leq .008$	6	12	$p \leq .03$
Expert	13.5	4.5	$p \leq .02$	16	2	$p \leq .004$
Enabler	14	4	$p \leq .01$	16	2	$p \leq .004$
Coercer	12	6	$p \leq .03$	13	5	$p \leq .02$
Leg. Auth.	15	3	$p \leq .008$	13	5	$p \leq .02$
Norm Setter	17.5	.5	$p \leq .002$	12	6	$p \leq .03$
Involver	11	7	$p \leq .04$	15	3	$p \leq .008$

[b] Respondent n (high-achieving) = 26
Respondent n (other schools) = 89

LEVEL 1	PRINCIPAL:
	IS A BELIEVER: COMMITTED; REDEDICATES HIM/HERSELF TO QUALITY EDUCATION;
	DEVELOPS ACTIVITIES CONSISTENT WITH THE PURPOSES OF EDUCATION;
	ESTABLISHES BUILDING GOALS AND SETS NORMS;
	REMAKES SCHEDULE TO SUPPORT SUCH PRACTICES AS LEARNING BLOCKS AND COMMON TEACHER PLANNING TIME;
	FOSTERS OPEN COMMUNICATION, DECISION-MAKING AND PROBLEM-SOLVING CHANNELS;
	REFOCUSES HIS/HER EFFORTS ON INSTRUCTION
LEVEL 2	PRINCIPAL:
	FOCUSES ON CLIMATE, HIGH EXPECTATIONS, BASIC SKILLS, ASSESSMENT, PUPIL ACHIEVEMENT (AND REFOCUSES STAFF INTEREST ON THESE);
	PLANS WITH A SENSE OF TIMING AND MOVES FROM PROBLEM TO PROGRAM ORIENTATION;
	IS HIGHLY VISIBLE (SCHOOL GROUNDS, HALLWAYS, AND CLASSROOMS);
	SCHEDULES INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISION SESSIONS; PLANS INSTRUCTIONAL EVENTS INTO THE SCHEDULE;
	PROVIDES ONGOING SUPPORT TO STAFF WHILE FOCUSING ON THE KEY GOALS OF THE PROJECT;
	STRIVES TO ACHIEVE SCHOOL NORMS;
	KNOWS SCHOOL; PUPILS, PARENTS, STAFF AND NEIGHBORHOOD; TREATS PARENTS/STUDENTS/STAFF WITH RESPECT;
	HAS A VISION OF A GOOD SCHOOL AND TRANSMITS THAT TO PUPILS, STAFF, PARENTS, ETC.
LEVEL 3	PRINCIPAL:
	COORDINATES INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS; EMPHASIZES ACHIEVEMENT; SETS BROAD SCHOOL-WIDE GOALS AND OBJECTIVES;
	SETS PERSONAL GOALS AND OBJECTIVES;
	TRANSMITS WELL-DEFINED SET OF GOALS TO FACULTY, PARENTS AND COMMUNITY;
	PLANS AND SCHEDULES TO MAKE OPTIMAL USE OF HUMAN AND PHYSICAL RESOURCES;
	ACCEPTS RESPONSIBILITY FOR WHAT GOES ON AT SCHOOL;
	EMPHASIZES TEACHER INSERVICE IN SPECIFIC CONTENT AREAS AND CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT TECHNIQUES;
	KEEPS ABREAST OF RESEARCH IN EDUCATION FOR IMPLEMENTATION AS NEEDED;
	TAKES ASSERTIVE DOMINANT ROLE IN DECISIONS ABOUT THE SELECTION OF INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS AND IN PROGRAM PLANNING AND EVALUATION;
	MONITORS THE INSTRUCTIONAL PROCESS;
	SETS STANDARDS OF PERFORMANCE FOR TEACHERS AND SELF

Figure 3. Three levels of principal behavior in implementing effective Schools activities (Project SHAL). (Achilles and Young, 1985; Achilles, et. al., 1983)

categorized. Training programs can be designed to teach principals those behaviors that seem associated with positive student outcomes, good climate, high expectations, etc. This base deserves to be tried.

Another area of research is adding to the research base available for designing principal preparation programs. Studies have been done to identify "competencies" for effective principals. (E.g., Croghan and Lake, 1984; Martinko and Gardner, 1983; Hoyle, 1985). Based upon these competencies, some have attempted to design training activities or modules which, hopefully, will lead to increased performance of those competencies by other principals. (I say "hopefully" because research and evaluation are still to be done). Some of this work is currently underway and is still too new for definitive results. After the developmental activities occur, research and evaluation of the training activity will provide information on the efficacy of this approach to preparing principals. There is, however, some good news--the competencies (identified in research) are being used as a base for the development of some training activity.

As a representation of the competency work, Figure 4 shows principal materials and training competencies as identified by Croghan and Lake (1984). Note that some competencies are "basic" in the sense that all principals should be able to do them. Other competencies are those exhibited by effective or "high-performing" principals.

Since all principals should demonstrate the basic competencies, training programs (at least for entry level) should incorporate ways to help the students develop and demonstrate an acceptable skill level in these basic competencies. Next, because we want all of our principals to be high-performance people and demonstrate high-performance competencies, training programs must address the high-performance competencies as well. (Perhaps for our advanced courses or

TABLE 4

CORRELATIONS OF EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS ELEMENTS OF GROUPS WITH TOTAL SCORES

GROUP	ADMIN	BASIC	EXPECT	ASSESS	CLIMATE
I (N = 4) (YRS = 3)	.77	.99	.91	.63	.92
II (N = 12) (YRS = 2)	.85	.82	.86	.86	.67
III (N = 3) (YRS = 1)	.99	-.07	.47	.99	.86
TOTAL	.90	.85	.91	.83	.78

SOME KEY CORRELATIONS OF SHAL FACTORS AND IMPLEMENTATION GROUPS (TOTAL SCORE WITH INDIVIDUAL FACTOR SCORES) (ACHILLES AND YOUNG; 1985)

academies).

The NASSP Assessment Center effort seems to encompass the competency approach (that is, competencies developed from research), and perhaps some elements of both theory and practice. But the trend seems to be emerging. Principal preparation programs probably will be produced in the future with more attention to the research base. This may be good, for in the past I fear that the programs relied most on practice, next (a distant second) on theory and least on research. All three bases are important. The mix or blend of the three bases can be adjusted to provide infinite variety.

Another Use for Research Base

Research can help us in other ways as we start to build our preparation programs on a research base. Research on communication, on change processes, on instruction and on learning has provided results that, when synthesized, can offer models to guide both the development and the operation of our preparation programs. The model shown in Figure 5 provides one set of ideas for synthesizing research results to aid in program development. The model employs elements from communication and change theory (Achilles and Norman, 1974) and has been expanded to encompass recent work by Joyce and Showers (1982) and Showers (1985). The last line of the model describes a general connection between this instructional development model and the instructional model developed by Madeline Hunter.

The model in Figure 5 expands ideas shown in Figure 1 and described by Achilles and Norman (1974). Instructional activity should have a purpose, and that purpose is related to change (for education seeks to change). Based upon the purposes, we should describe our methods (actually the media or channels for delivery), our audiences and the preferred size of the audience with which we will work. Once the above elements are known, there can be attention to such

THE PROPOSED HIGH PERFORMING AND BASIC COMPETENCIES

Cluster	High-Performing Competencies	Basic Competencies
Purpose and Direction	1. Proactive Orientation 2. Decisiveness	3. Commitment to School Mission
Cognitive Skills	4. Interpersonal Search 5. Information Search 6. Concept Formation 7. Conceptual Flexibility	
Consensus Management	8. Managing Interaction 9. Persuasiveness	10. Concern for Image 11. Tactical Adaptability
Quality Enhancement	12. Achievement Motivation 13. Management Control	14. Developmental Orientation
Organization	15. Organizational Ability	16. Delegation
Communication	17. Self Presentation	18. Written Communication 19. Organizational Sensitivity

DEFINITIONS AND BEHAVIORAL INDICATORS

FOR THE HIGH-PERFORMING COMPETENCIES

Figure 4. Competencies from Croghan and Lake (1983:42)

things as learning styles, assessment strategies, etc.

Conclusion

Research is becoming available to help us design preparation programs. The research is not only suggesting content, but it is also suggesting ways to structure our programs and ways to deliver the programs. The research base is expanding and is now available to join with the traditional bases--practice or craft knowledge and theory--as one element to be used in developing principal preparation programs. Now we need to do some research on the efficacy of using our research base in producing and providing principal preparation programs.

Activity \ Level	I	II	III	IV
Purpose	Understanding. Conceptual. Control.	Skill Building Expanded Knowledge Base.	Transfer of Skill and Knowledge.	Application of Skills and Knowledge. Relationships.
Relation to Change	Awareness/Interest; Initiation. Dissemination	Trial/Evaluation; Implementation. Demonstration	Use/Adoption; Incorporation. Diffusion	Institutionalization and Renewal.
Method(s)	Lecture, Reading. Some Question-and-Answer. (Q and A). Didactic. One-way Communication.	Demonstration Group. Work Discussion. Critique. Q and A. Two-way Communication. Case studies; Case record.	Practice with Feedback. Simulation; Role Play. Involvement. Q and A. Coaching; Counseling. Develop of "Action Plan."	Practice with Feedback. Synthesis and Application. Counseling. Consulting Self Motivation.
Targeted Audience	Undefined: Uncertain.	General Definition.	Specific Definition.	Precisely Defined.
Mode(s)	Large group. Individual.	Small group. Individual	Small group; Mostly One-on-one. Individual.	Pairs, Teams, Coaching. Individual work.
Assessment Strategies	Paper-pencil Tests. Memory.	Oral and Written Test Processes. Demonstration	Observe & Critique. "Paragraph Analyses." Demo./Discuss.	Discuss/Refine. Informal Processes. Elaborate Design.
Learning Style(s)	Cognitive: Print-Oriented.	Oral/Aural.	Interactive/Motor.	Combined. (several)
General Relation to M. Hunter	Instructional Input.	Instructional Input. Modeling.	Check Understanding. Guided Practice.	Independent Practice. Self Improvement.

Figure 5. A Suggested Model to Guide Development of Instructional Modules or Training Programs.

Bibliography and References

Achilles, C. M. (1984). "A Proposal for Excellence in Educational Administration," Paper at National Conference of Profesors of Educational Administration (NCPEA), Orono, ME, August. ERIC, ED 246557 (EA 017028). (a)

Achilles, C. M. (1984) "Forecast: Stormy Weather Ahead for Educational Administration," Issues in Education, 1, 4(Fall, 1984). (b)

Achilles, C. M. (1981). "Quo Vadis? (Quo Vaduisti vadesque?) Some Approaches to the Use of Humanities in Leadership Preparation Programs," Paper at AERA, Los Angeles, ED 202-166.

Achilles, C. M. and L. W. Hughes (1972). "The Paired Administrator Team Concept: A Promising Administrator Training Model," Planning and Changing, 3, 2 (July). pp. 45-50.

Achilles, C. M. and J. Keedy (1983/84). "Principal Norm Setting as a Component of Effective Schools." National Forum of Educational Administration and Supervision, 1, 1, pp. 58-68. Also ED 227-545.

Achilles, C. M. and D. Norman (1974). "Communication and Change in Education," Planning and Changing, 5, 3 (Fall). pp. 138-142.

Achilles, C. M., R. Young, J. Leonard, R. High (1983). "Development and Use of a Replication and Evaluation Model to Track the Implementation of Effective Schools Elements in an Inner-City Setting: Project SHAL, St. Louis, MO," Resources in Education, ED 227-546.

Achilles, C. M. and R. Young (1985). "Tracking the Implementation of Three Years of Effective Schooling Elements in Project SHAL, St. Louis, Mo. (1981-1984)," Paper at AERA, Chicago, April. Sec. 47.30.

Acheson, K. (1985). "The Principals's Role in Instructional Leadership," OSSC Bulletin, 28, 8(April). University of Oregon: Oregon School Study Council. 25 pp.

Baltzell, D. C. and R. A. Dentler (1983). Selecting American School Principals: A Sourcebook for Educators. ABT Associates for National Institute of Education, Washington, D. C., pp. 1-65.

Blumberg, A. (1984). "The Craft of School Administration and Some Other Rambling Thoughts," EAQ, 20, 4(Fall). pp. 24-40.

Croghan, J. H. and D. G. Lake (1984). "Competencies of Effective Principals and Strategies for Implementation," Occasional Papers in Educational Policy Analysis, #410. Southern Regional Council for Educational Improvement, Research Triangle Park, NC, November.

Donmoyer, R. (1985). "Cognitive Anthropology and Research on Effective Principals," EAQ, 21, 2(Spring). pp. 31-58.

Edmonds, Ronald (1979). "Effective Schools for the Urban Poor," Educational Leadership, 37, 1(October). pp. 15-24.

Erickson, D. A. (1979). "Research on Educational Administration: The State of the Art," Educational Researchers, 8, 3(March). pp. 9-14.

Firestone, W. A. and B. L. Wilson, (1985). "Using Bureaucratic and Cultural Linkages to Improve Instruction: The Principals Contribution," EAQ, 21 2(Spring). pp. 7-30).

High R. M. (1984). "Influence-Gaining Behaviors of Principals in Schools of Varying Levls of Instructional Effectiveness," Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, (August). DAI Vol. 45, no. 10, p. 3040, A84.

High, R. M. and C. M. Achilles, (1985). "An Analysis of Influence-Gaining Behaviors of Principals in Schools of Varying Levels of Instructional Effectiveness." Paper prepared for TASCD, July. Currently out for publication review.

Hoyle, John R. (1985). "Programs in Educational Administration and the AASA Preparation Guidelines," EAQ, 21, 1(Winter). pp. 71-93. Also AASA Guidelines, Hoyle, 1983.

Joyce, B. R. and B. Showers (1982). "The Coaching of Teaching." Educational Leadership, 40(October). pp. 4-10.

Katz, R. L. (1974). "Skills of An Effective Administrator," Harvard Business Review, 52, 2(Sept-Oct). pp. 90-102.

Keedy, J. L. "Norm Setting as a Component of Principal Effectivess," Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, (August). DAI Vol. 43, no. 9, p. 2846, A83.

Martinko, M J. and W. L. Gardner (1983). "An Executive Summary of: The Behavior of High Performing Educational Managers: An Observational Study," Tallahassee, FL: Dept. of Management, College of Business, Florida State University. 66 pp.

Miklos, E. (1983). "Evolution in Administrator Preparation Programs," EAQ, 19, 3(Summer). pp. 153-177. This entire issue of EAQ addresses issues in educational administration.

National Association of Secondary School Principals (1984). The Effective Principal: A Research Summary. Reston, VA: NASSP.

Peters, T. J. and R. H. Waterman (1982). In Search of Excellence. New York: Harper and Row.

Russell, J. S., T. E. White and S. D. Maurer (1985). "Effective and Ineffective Behaviors of Secondary School Principals Linked with School Effectiveness," Paper at AERA, Chicago, IL.

Showers, B. (1985). "Teachers Coaching Teachers," Educational Leadership, 42(April). pp. 43-48.

APPENDIX A

The idea of employing three bases to support preparation programs productions interesting. These three bases (Practice or Craft Knowledge, Theory, and Research) to relate well to other conceptualizations of preparation programs. Blumberg (1985) has recently spoken eloquently for the need to view administration as neither an art nor a science, but as a craft. The professional literature has continuously debated whether administration was a science or an art, or both, or neither. Achilles (1981) suggested that administration was both art and science, and that training programs should reflect that dichotomy. Achilles, in urging use of "humanities" in preparation programs saw relationships in the dichotomy as the following:

ADMINISTRATION AS ART	ADMINISTRATION AS SCIENCE
The "Why" Question	The "How" Question
Liberal Arts/Humanities	Behavioral Sciences
Conceptual	Technical

This dichotomy, while interesting, seems flawed in the face of new data. High and Achilles (1985) revised the above dichotomy by adding the principal-as-expert (or ADMINISTRATION AS EXCHANGE) dimension. This dimension, however, is not the same order as the other two (ART/SCIENCE). Blumberg's (1985) conceptualization of ADMINISTRATION AS CRAFT adds the dimension of the same order as the other two (ART/SCIENCE). The following model seems useful: (Subject, of course, to critical review and revision).

ADMINISTRATION AS:

ART ⟷	SCIENCE ⟷	CRAFT
The Why" Questions	The "What" Questions	The "How" Questions
Liberal arts/Humanities	Behavioral Sciences	Precedent/Tradition
Theory/Conceptual	Theory/Technical	Practice
Research (Ideas)	Research ("Scientific")	Research (Trial-and-Error)

PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT BASE

Theory ⟷ Research ⟷ Practice

Figure A. Proposed Model of Elements of Administration and Bases for Preparation Program Development.

Although the transition is not exact, it is temptingly close. Preparation programs should include all three elements with an appropriate mix or blend, and these elements relate (generally) to the Theory Base (Art), the Practice Base (Craft) and the Research Base (Science).